

Rhode Island Department of Education  
Office of Student, Community and Academic Supports

School Support System Report and Support Plan

Providence Public Schools  
January 9-12, 2012

# **SCHOOL SUPPORT SYSTEM**

## **A Collaborative System of Focused Monitoring**

### Introduction

The purpose of the School Support System (SSS) is to provide a means of accountability for delivery of programs and services for students with exceptionalities. The School Support System model is designed to promote the involvement of the whole school district, general educators as well as special educators and parents. It is designed to learn if the district meets the regulations and what effects programs and services have on student outcomes. Finally, the SSS develops a school support plan for training and technical assistance.

To accomplish this the SSS includes these components:

- The Orientation Meeting The Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) staff meets with the Local Education Agency (LEA) to plan the site review and identify issues or initiatives that may influence programs or service delivery.
- Data Analysis Meeting The RIDE staff meets to review LEA demographic information on selected reports including: the LEA annual plan, census information, and information collected through record review, staff questionnaires and parent interviews. To ensure that the child is at the center of the study, all analyses begin with the child. Thus, a sample of approximately 30 students with exceptionalities is selected; the records of these students are reviewed; their parents, teachers and related service providers are interviewed, and their classrooms are observed. The result is an in-depth, unified examination of the actual provision of programs and services for students with exceptionalities. The RIDE staff compiles a preliminary summary of their analyses of this data.
- Presentation by the LEA and School Site Review The on-site review begins with a presentation of programs by teachers and staff. The presentation provides the review team with general and specific information on delivery of programs and services to students. Following this presentation, on-site reviews to all schools are made. The team members interview school administrators and teaching staff. Parents and central office staff are also interviewed. The team gathers sufficient information and works with the LEA personnel to generate a report, covering the following:
  - The district's compliance with the state and federal regulations, relative to the education of students with exceptionalities.
  - The quality and effectiveness of programs and services provided by the district.
  - The need for professional development and technical assistance that will enable the LEA to improve programs and services.
- The Support Plan The RIDE team, LEA central office and building administrators meet to review the data and complete a report of results. The group designs a professional development/technical assistance support plan with timelines for implementation. This plan enables the school and district to correct areas of non-compliance and to strengthen promising programs and correct areas of weakness in order to improve services and programs for all students.
- The SSS Report The report summarizes the findings from the various data sources. The format of the report uses four divisions: Indicators, Findings, Documentation, and Support Plan. Indicators describe either performance or compliance. Findings can include a variety of some six categories, from School Improvement to Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment. The documentation section of the report distinguishes the source of the finding. The support plan reflects the response to the described findings. The support plan describes the corrective action required by the district as well as resources and time lines to improve programs and services.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1. Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)
2. Evaluation/ Individual Education Program (IEP)
3. IDEA Transition

**Providence Public Schools  
SCHOOL SUPPORT SYSTEM REVIEW  
JANUARY 9 – 12, 2012**

**TEAM MEMBERS**

**ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEAM MEMBERS**

**Team A** – Barrie Grossi, Melissa Moniz

**Team B** – Denise Achin, Tracy Andrews-Mellouise, Michele Walden-Doppke

**Team C** – Ruth Gallucci, Carrie Sullivan, Amy Bergeron

**Team D** – Sally Arsenault, Deborah Garneau

**MIDDLE SCHOOL TEAM MEMBERS**

**Team E** – Sue Constable, Sharon Schubert

**Team F** – Jane Keane, Onna Mechanic-Holland

**Team G** – Emily Klein, Lisa Martin

**Team H** – Alice Woods, Arthur Plitt, Greg Stewart

## **HIGH SCHOOL TEAM MEMBERS**

**Team I** – Susan Wood, David Rosen, William Cauley

**Team J** – Jane Slade, William Kimes, Lisa Gaddes

**Team K** – Nancy Stevenin, Katie Gomes, Joe Walejko

**Team L** – Jonathan Dyson

**Alternative Program Settings: E-Cubed Academy, Juanita Sanchez Complex, the Providence Career & Technical Academy, the Transition Academy at Johnson & Wales University and Birch Vocational Center**

<b>1. FREE APPROPRIATE PUBLIC EDUCATION IN THE LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT (FAPE/LRE)</b>					
Indicator		Findings	Documentation	Support Plan	Follow-up Findings
		The RIDE, Office of Student, Community & Academic Supports School Support System process was facilitated to provide a means of accountability for delivery of programs and services to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The following pages reflect the findings of that process.	Data Analysis State Performance Plan		
Result	1	<p><b>Least Restrictive Environment Data (State Performance Plan Indicator #5)</b></p> <p>Based on the FY July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010 State Performance Plan information on Providence Public Schools Placement Data is as follows:</p> <p>The percentage of students educated 80 to 100% of the time in general education settings is 62.95%. (RI District Average is 70.86%)</p> <p>Percentage of students educated for less than 40% of the time in general education settings is 25.36%. (RI District Average is 14.55%)</p> <p>Percentage of students educated in private separate schools, homebound/hospitalized and private residential schools is 7.5%. (RI District Average is 5.14%)</p>	Data Analysis State Performance Plan		
Result	2	<p>Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments (<b>State Performance Plan Indicator #3</b>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. The district ( disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size) did <u>not</u> meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup</li> <li>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs. 98%</li> <li>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards 11.69% [Note: State has individual grade and content area targets (26%). State target is average target across grades and content areas. District target is average percent of students proficient across content areas (11.69%).]</li> </ul>	Data Analysis State Performance Plan		

Result	3	<p><b>Instructional Strategies and Supports</b></p> <p>Throughout the schools there were examples of student centered, teacher facilitated student learning objectives, with posted rubrics, modeling, cooperative learning, student lead projects and problem solving, posted agendas and student work along with homework assignments, independent self-selected reading and journal writing all aligned to the Early Learning Standards, and Common Core State Standards.</p> <p>Use of student assessment and performance data to inform instructional practices was evident throughout the district. School faculty are engaged in analyzing student data such as the SWIS, GRADE, DRA, NECAP, teacher generated assessments, student work and performance along with classroom observations to discuss student placement (reading and math) and instructional strategies.</p>	Data Analysis Interviews Observation		
Result	4	<p><b>District Level Response to Intervention (Rtl) Structure</b></p> <p>A systemic process of Rtl is being built throughout the district and is led through the framework of a Teacher Support Team (TST). The model, lead by the district Curriculum Coordinator, has developed district level protocols and procedures. Currently Providence schools are in various stages of implementation.</p> <p>Universal screeners, as well as the use of progress monitoring, teacher generated assessments, and curriculum based formative and summative assessments, state assessment, student work and performance along with classroom observations, determine student placement within tier II and/or tier III intervention support.</p> <p>Students at or above proficiency (based on assessments) in reading and/or math (as determined by assessment analysis) engage in core instruction within the grade level curriculum. Student progress is monitored through core curriculum based formative and summative assessments along with specific program assessments as appropriate.</p> <p>For students on or near proficiency in reading and/or math who may be struggling within a specific area receive tier II targeted instruction that supplements the core. Students receive instruction in core grade level curriculum along with an additional period of targeted intervention that is designed to reinforce achievement in the core grade level curriculum. Student progress is monitored through curriculum based formative and summative assessments, and in targeted interventions using program specific assessments.</p> <p>Student's two or more grade levels below proficiency in ELA or math, participate in instruction that temporarily replaces the core. Students receive intensive interventions for extended time</p>	Data Analysis Interviews Observation		

		(secondary level: 2 periods or 90 minutes) designed to accelerate progress. Student progress is monitored using program specific assessments and comparative gap analysis along with formalized ELA and math assessments.			
Result/ Compliance	5	<p><b>Response to Intervention (RtI) at the Elementary Level</b></p> <p>Some elementary schools have restarted RtI this year to more systematically implement the district protocols. A few use alternative protocols unique to their schools. Two elementary schools (Bailey and Martin Luther King) did not show evidence of systemic protocols and staff reported avoiding academic referrals. Schools use a variety of intervention approaches and providers, using special educators in some instances, “intervention assistants” or relevant evaluation team members or specialists in other cases.</p> <p>Leadership of TSTs varies among the elementary schools, including general education teachers, principals, a reading coach, or co-chairing by a special educator/ESL teacher pair. Some TSTs meet on a semi-weekly or weekly schedule and others meet based on TST referrals. Membership is variable as well. For example, some have standing TST members and may include both general and/or special educators and/or evaluation team members, in addition to intervention specialists. In one school, the grade level of the student referred triggers invitation of the parent, all common grade level teachers, and others as applicable to the student. Interventions generated by well functioning TSTs are distinct from the tiers of interventions built into the reading and math curricula. TSTs assist teachers in setting “smart goals” for planned evidenced based interventions, and often use interventions derived from DIBELS and multiple classroom based performance data, to be implemented as an add-on to teaching already underway, using additional resources such as the special educator or instructional assistant. The amount of student performance data collected varies across schools from four to eight weeks depending upon the student, team and school. (RI Regulations 300.307(2))</p>	Data Analysis Interviews Observation	<p>Central office special education administration will work in conjunction with school-based teams to develop a response to intervention team and implementation of all related protocols and structures.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. Progress check: December 2012</p>	Issue Resolved
Result	6	<p><b>Response to Intervention (RtI) at the Middle Level</b></p> <p>At the middle level school-based intervention tier instruction in English language arts (ELA) and math has been developed for both all students who may be at-risk for school failure. Student progress is monitored through curriculum based formative and summative assessments, and in targeted interventions using program specific assessments. Daily progress is tracked and graphed in both ELA and Math data management systems. In some schools, instructional leadership teams and grade level teams discuss data and student progress in tier II and III.</p> <p>Tiered interventions are prescribed instruction with specific academic activities/steps with the overarching goal for students to return to grade level proficiency for entrance into the general</p>			



		<p>education ELA class (on grade level) by the 9<sup>th</sup> grade. For students participating in tier III math intervention the goal is for students to be able to participate in the 9<sup>th</sup> grade algebra class at grade level. Students who are placed in tier III intervention, however, may spend 1-3 years in these intervention classes that can be as large as 18 students per teacher.</p> <p>In most schools, daily progress reports for social-emotional/behavioral needs are widely used by general educators, special educators, and counselors. In some schools, administrators review SWIS data with faculty. Some schools currently are not entering SWIS data due to the unclear responsibility of that function.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>TST/ Rtl School Based Initiatives</b></p> <p><b>Esek Hopkins Middle School</b> has a TST team headed by the school psychologist. It meets once a week to review referrals. Though forms have been developed by the district, school based faculty redesigned the documents to one page limiting the needed information to assure informed decisions. Rtl is being utilized for academic, social skills and behavior.</p> <p>Though the Teacher Support Team (TST) at <b>Gilbert Stuart Middle School</b> a structured functional school-based team, new leadership has been identified (special education teacher) along with the previous team membership re-confirming their commitment and participation. The status of the TST at this time is in the process of being reorganized.</p> <p>At <b>DelSesto Middle School</b> there are two teams that work under the umbrella of Rtl. The Teacher Support Team is involved primarily with referrals due to difficulties with academics while the Targeted Team receives referrals for behavioral issues and review SWIS Data. DelSesto implements PBIS strategies as part of the Safe and Caring Schools Initiative. There is a focus this year to develop interventions for students in Tier II, including social skills and other focused groups, and “check in and check out”.</p> <p>At <b>Roger Williams Middle School</b> an Rtl/TST/Targeted team reviews academic concerns while a PBIS/Safe and Caring Schools Team reviews social emotional needs. These teams are comprised of a balance of general and special educators. Few referrals come in as most problem solving occurs on the grade level and/or content area teams monthly along with an intervention system in place to meet the needs of student groups. An Instructional Leadership Team reviews the SWIS and academic data.</p>			
Result/ Compliance	7	<p><b>Response to Intervention (Rtl) at the High School Level</b></p> <p>At the majority of high schools there was a Response to Intervention team (sometimes referred to as a TST, Wellness, or the Targeted Team). Many staff reported that they would like a more</p>		Special education administration will work in conjunction with school-based	For 2012-2013 school year, (TST) Wellness and/or Targeted Teams

		structured approach to data and progress reporting. Two of the high schools visited (Juanita Sanchez Education Complex and Providence Career and Technical Academy) did not have an Rtl team, although staff reported receiving some training in this area. (RI Regulations 300.307(2))		administration to develop a response to intervention team and implementation of all related protocols and structures.  Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. Progress check: December 2012	continued to work with teachers to focus on student needs and supports at Juanita Sanchez High School.																																														
Compliance	8	<b>SPP Disproportionate Representation (State Performance Plan Indicators #9 and #10)</b> The district has been identified as having significant disproportionality in its identification of students with disabilities as shown by the data in the following tables. <table> <tr> <td></td> <td>LD</td> <td colspan="2">ADR</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Native American</td> <td>2009</td> <td>2010</td> <td>2009 2010</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Students with Disability</td> <td>19</td> <td>58</td> <td>42 115</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Students</td> <td>159</td> <td>455</td> <td>151 455</td> </tr> <tr> <td>District Risk</td> <td>11.95</td> <td>12.75</td> <td>26.42 25.27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nat'l Risk</td> <td>4.14</td> <td>3.82</td> <td>9.15 8.92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>District Risk Ratio</td> <td>2.89</td> <td>3.34</td> <td>2.89 2.83</td> </tr> </table> <table> <tr> <td></td> <td>ED</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black</td> <td>2009 2010</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Students with Disability</td> <td>222 189</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Students</td> <td>5277 4878</td> </tr> <tr> <td>District Risk</td> <td>4.21 3.87</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nat'l Risk</td> <td>0.72 0.63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>District Risk Ratio</td> <td>5.84 6.15</td> </tr> </table> <table> <tr> <td></td> <td>ED</td> <td>ASD</td> <td>ADR</td> </tr> </table>		LD	ADR		Native American	2009	2010	2009 2010	Students with Disability	19	58	42 115	Total Students	159	455	151 455	District Risk	11.95	12.75	26.42 25.27	Nat'l Risk	4.14	3.82	9.15 8.92	District Risk Ratio	2.89	3.34	2.89 2.83		ED	Black	2009 2010	Students with Disability	222 189	Total Students	5277 4878	District Risk	4.21 3.87	Nat'l Risk	0.72 0.63	District Risk Ratio	5.84 6.15		ED	ASD	ADR	Data Analysis Record Reviews Document Review Interviews	Examination of practices in the identification of learning disabilities and emotional disturbance as a measure to prevent more areas of disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification practices. This support plan includes correction of the cited cases.  Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. Progress check: March 2013	Issue resolved
	LD	ADR																																																	
Native American	2009	2010	2009 2010																																																
Students with Disability	19	58	42 115																																																
Total Students	159	455	151 455																																																
District Risk	11.95	12.75	26.42 25.27																																																
Nat'l Risk	4.14	3.82	9.15 8.92																																																
District Risk Ratio	2.89	3.34	2.89 2.83																																																
	ED																																																		
Black	2009 2010																																																		
Students with Disability	222 189																																																		
Total Students	5277 4878																																																		
District Risk	4.21 3.87																																																		
Nat'l Risk	0.72 0.63																																																		
District Risk Ratio	5.84 6.15																																																		
	ED	ASD	ADR																																																

White	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010
Students with Disability	127	97	47	43	654	507
Total Students	2802	2175	2802	2175	2802	2175
District Risk	4.53	4.46	1.68	1.98	23.34	23.31
Nat'l Risk	0.72	0.63	0.29	0.44	9.15	8.92
District Risk Ratio	6.3	7.08	5.78	4.49	2.55	2.61

Examination of the data by the required 7 races confirms significant disproportionality in the following categories:

	ED		LD		ADR	
American Indian	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Students with Disability	11	10	35	35	65	65
Total Students	218	219	218	219	218	219
District Risk	5.05	4.57	16.06	15.98	29.82	22.75
Nat'l Risk	0.63	0.56	3.82	3.51	8.92	8.46
District Risk Ratio	8.01	8.15	4.2	4.55	3.34	3.51

	ED			ED	
Black	2010	2011	Two or More	2010	2011
Students with Disability	179	175	Students with Disability	20	23
Total Students	4584	4356	Total Students	657	671
District Risk	3.9	4.02	District Risk	3.04	3.43
Nat'l Risk	0.63	0.56	Nat'l Risk	0.63	0.56
District Risk Ratio	6.2	7.17	District Risk Ratio	4.83	6.12

	ED		ASD		ADR	
White	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Students with Disability	97	73	43	54	507	476
Total Students	2175	2092	2175	2092	2175	2092
District Risk	4.46	3.49	1.98	2.58	23.31	22.75
Nat'l Risk	0.63	0.56	0.44	0.54	8.92	8.46

		<div>District Risk Ratio</div> <div>7.08      6.23      4.49      4.78      2.61      2.69</div> <p>A review of policies, procedures, and practices provided evidence of many appropriate revisions to policies and procedures. However, additional probes in the form of further data analysis, record reviews, and interviews reveal the revised procedures are not fully implemented with consistent practice (SA 2, 5, 6; SW 2, 4; BG1; EK 3, 4; JK 1, 2, 3, 4).</p> <p><b>Disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification</b> practices is identified in the following categories: Learning Disabilities for students who are American Indian/Native American; Emotional Disturbance for students who are Black. (RI Regulation 300.173)</p> <p>Risk ratios hover between 2.0 and the 2.5 threshold for learning disabilities across most racial/ethnic groups but do not yet consistently meet 2.5 for two consecutive years. In light of the record review findings for this area, the district is strongly urged to examine practices in the identification of Learning Disabilities as a measure to prevent more areas of disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification practices.</p>			
Result	9	<p><b>Suspension (State Performance Plan Indicator #4): Significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions (for students with IEPs) greater than 10 days as compared to the rate of suspensions (for students without IEPs) greater than 10 days.</b></p> <p>In 2008-2009, Providence had 44 students with IEPs suspended more than 10 days. The total of all students suspended more than 10 days was 191. In 2009-2010, Providence had 51 students suspended more than 10 days. The total of all students suspended more than 10 days was 188. There is no significant discrepancy.</p> <p><b>Social emotional resources / positive behavioral supports</b>  <b>Elementary Level</b>  At the elementary level, social emotional and behavioral supports vary among the elementary schools, ranging from school-designed, school-wide community-building culture, to schools without school-wide approaches where individual teachers determine their behavioral management approach to schools, having adopted the Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports model with variable levels of fidelity.</p> <p>Schools with and without formal “behavior classrooms” indicate that the nurse, psychologist, or social worker are available to consult with if needed, assist with behavioral interventions, or create a safety plan. Some TSTs address referrals for assistance with both academic and behavioral concerns and assist teachers with planning behavioral interventions. For example, TSTs at both Veazie and Kennedy have organized their TST process for all students to include a Targeted Team designed for those students who need social emotional and behavioral</p>	Data Analysis State Performance Plan Interviews Observation		

		<p>supports. There is a defined process for data collection, referral and tiered interventions based upon the student's individual needs.</p> <p>Functional behavioral assessments and behavioral intervention plans are developed for students. Consistent application and implementation of these plans with fidelity was not observed in all schools.</p> <p><b>Middle Level</b> At the Middle level there was a wide variety of activities supporting student's social emotional and behavioral growth. All middle schools participate in the "Safe and Caring Schools" initiative, using an array of school-based programs. Across the middle level students have access to all related support personnel including school psychologists, social workers, and counselors, after school programs, along with community organizations. Administrators and faculty have created a personalized environment for all students.</p> <p><b>High School Level</b> At the high school level there were a myriad of social emotional resources and supports. It was evident that administrators, teachers and staff were student-focused and created a personalized environment to meet individual student needs (See additional information for Providence Career &amp; Technical Academy, and E-Cubed Academy as outlined in the high school program continuum).</p> <p><b>School Removals/Disciplinary Policies</b> Throughout the district behavioral expectations along with disciplinary action protocols and policies are comprehensively defined in a student handbook.</p>			
Result	10	<p><b>Preschool Continuum</b> Preschool services are primarily provided in four elementary schools as well as within community-based childcare settings. A variety of placements on the continuum are available including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Full day and half day integrated classrooms with seven students with IEPs and eight community peers.</li> <li>-Full day English as Second Language (ESL) integrated classrooms with seven students with IEPs and eight community peers.</li> <li>-Half day bilingual integrated classrooms with seven students with IEPs and eight community peers.</li> <li>-Full day and half day special education classrooms for students with ASD, behavioral needs and significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul> <p>The district collects early childhood outcomes data for children with IEPs as required by the</p>	Data Analysis State Performance Plan		Issued Resolved See attached memo 4/22/13 from supervisor Mindy Mertz

Compliance		<p>federal Office of Special Education Programs. Teachers collect and enter authentic assessment information into Teaching Strategies Gold. This assessment information is used to shape and individualize instruction and to demonstrate progress. The Preschool Director and the Intervention Specialist are responsible for implementing processes, procedures, and monitoring strategies to ensure the fidelity of the data collection. The district has provided a number of professional development opportunities for new and existing staff. This year they have begun to train principals to assist with the monitoring and use of data.</p> <p>The percent of preschool children who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings) is 88% (<b>State Performance Plan Indicator #6</b>). Concerns regarding access to general education exist for students in special education preschool classrooms designed for students with behavioral needs and autism spectrum disorders. Several staff members indicated that although students would benefit from spending portions of their day in integrated settings, they believed that the classrooms were at capacity. As these students are not counted on the general education rosters, the opportunities for LRE are at times limited or unavailable. (RI Regulations 300.101 &amp; 300.114)</p> <p><b>State Performance Plan Indicator #7</b></p> <p>Of the preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations, the percentage who demonstrated substantial improvements by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the preschool program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); 73%</li> <li>-Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); 78%</li> <li>-Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. 83%</li> </ul>		<p>Professional development and training regarding inclusive practices will occur. Further, the district will ensure systemic access to general education preschool opportunities for preschool students with IEPs.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. Progress check: April 2013.</p>	
Result/ Compliance	11	<p><b>Elementary Level</b></p> <p>At the elementary level, the Providence School Department provides an array of service options for children with disabilities. There is great variation among schools in the service options and the degree to which decisions are based upon individual student need versus service availability. (RI Regulations 300.101 &amp; 300.114)</p> <p>The program continuum is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Full time placement in an English, English as a Second Language (ESL) or bilingual general education classroom with special education services provided within the classroom: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For up to one hour (referred to as “resource”)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Data Analysis Interviews Observation	The district will ensure systemic access to general education opportunities for students with IEPs. Separate rosters will end so that all students with IEPs will now be on general education	Issued Resolved Quarterly memo sent to s/c teachers dated 1/31/2013

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For one to two hours (referred to as “intensive resource”)</li> </ul> <p>-Full time placement in an English, ESL, or bilingual general education classroom to which a special educator is assigned for a half-day (referred to as “co-teaching”). The special educator is generally assigned to two grades and spends a half-day in each grade level class. The manner in which the co-teachers work together varies, ranging from shared planning and instruction with co-teaching, to division of students with special educator assisting instruction.</p> <p>-Full time placement in English, ESL, or bilingual general education classroom to which a special educator is assigned for the whole day (referred to as “inclusion”). Teachers work collaboratively in shared planning and co-teaching for all students.</p> <p>-Placement in general education with special education services provided both within and outside the classroom (referred to as “resource”).</p> <p>-Special education classes for more than 80% of the day. Students are grouped according to similarity of needs, but not by disability category. Students in most of these classes are assigned to the special class for homeroom and receive all academic instruction from a special educator in the separate setting. In some schools (Bailey and Martin Luther King), students travel in a group to participate with peers for lunch and in general education itinerant classes. Staff at Bailey and Martin Luther King did report that there were students with IEPs who they thought would benefit from math, science, social students in the general education classroom but they couldn’t send them there as there was no room because of the general education class roster being filled to capacity.</p> <p>-Special education classrooms for children whose primary disability is Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD). Research-based strategies as well as staff support designed to meet the unique communication, social and learning needs of these students is evident. Opportunities to participate with peers in general education activities are based on individual student needs but somewhat hampered by available “slots” within general education groupings</p> <p>-Special education classes for children whose primary challenge is social emotional/behavioral (referred to as the “Behavioral Intervention Program”). Staff at Bailey reported that there were students with IEPs who they thought would benefit from math, science, and social studies in the general education classroom but they couldn’t send them there as there was no room because of the general education class roster being filled to capacity.</p> <p>-Special education classes for students with significant disabilities and eligible for alternate assessment. (The district refers to this as “exceptional children services”. However, some staff referred to the program as the “severe-profound program” or “230-day program”). Students in</p>		<p>rosters.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. Progress check: April 2013.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Result		<p>this program have limited opportunities to participate with typical peers in general education classes as these classes have separate [self-contained] elective classes (e.g., art, music).</p> <p>At Veazie School, the district has implemented a new “Integrated Special Education Program”. This model assigns one special education teacher to each grade level team and provides supports to students with disabilities in general education settings. The special educator also provides general core curriculum intervention supports for mathematics and reading in small groups to both general education students and students with disabilities. Staff report this model allows them to provide greater access to core curriculum for the students with disabilities as well as specific interventions to meet their IEP needs. They review, analyze and use student data to inform changes necessary to better implement this “new” model of service delivery.</p> <p>Availability of well-functioning technology for faculty and student learning is variable among elementary schools. At some schools (Spaziano, Carnevale, Bailey, MLK), workflow problems exist for principals and special educators, due to the district’s web-centric system of documentation, records, and professional development. It takes 20 minutes for computers to start up, and programs such as Word take several minutes to open. Computers are outdated and are not in working condition. This impedes staff’s ability to manage Medicaid billing in a timely manner, with staff making repeated unsuccessful attempts within the brief opportunities available.</p> <p>This technology concern also interferes with students’ instructional time on computers during students’ limited computer access time; they become frustrated and sometimes experience no active computer use during the time available, due to slow functioning.</p> <p>Copiers in some schools (Spaziano, Bailey, and Martin Luther King) also have limited capacity, hampering the required copying of Reading Street tests and worksheets and math interventions, homework and tests. One special educator went to a commercial printer at her own expense to make copies of math intervention practice pages, to create student booklets needed for math interventions, rather than experience copier roadblocks to materials preparation. One related service provider bought his own computer and printer to keep in school, out of frustration and to enable him to get his reports and online work done.</p>		<p>Central office administration will review and resolve this issue.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. Progress check: January 2013.</p>	<p>Special Education utilized grant funds to purchase computers, ipads and printers to update technology. Each school inturn works with the technology department and has a refresher plan that assesses their needs for technology upgrades. This includes copiers.</p>
Result/ Compliance	12	<p><b>Program Continuum Middle Level</b></p> <p>Specialized instruction is facilitated at the middle level through inclusive practices with co-teachers (general educator and special educator) in most intervention tiers for ELA and/or Math. Special educators may also provide academic support within the general education core classes in ELA and Math. A “push in” model was established last year for students needing</p>	<p>Data Analysis Interviews Observation</p>		



	<p>more direct instruction and support. Students are provided direct instruction by their special education teacher within a self contained setting for tier III ELA (Language!). As a group (including the special education teacher and teacher assistant) the students participate in a tier III TransMath class, in addition to the core social studies and science classes. The “push in” model supports students’ independence in participating in all elective classes including physical education on their own. The special education teacher for the self-contained “push in” model is the teacher of record. All students have access to grade level social studies and science. In some instances with the inclusive classes, there is a teacher assistant to provide support and in one school the special educator also attended social studies and science. Teachers reported that differentiating instruction was difficult for these subjects as the gap of achievement was quite large.</p> <p>Currently, at the middle level there is not scheduled common planning time. Often educators plan informally, however special educators providing specialized instruction and support across grade levels and/or co-teaching have limited opportunity for planning discussions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>School Based Specialized Programs</b></p> <p>There are approximately 930 students attending <b>DelSesto Middle School</b> in grades 6-8, with 21% being students with IEPs. While there are not specific teams at the middle school, there is looping for the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two specialized classes (self contained settings) are provided for students needing individualized support, direct instruction and life skills experiences. Students currently participate with their typically developing peers only at lunch. There are currently 18 students participating in this instructional setting all requiring an alternate assessment.</li> <li>• An additional specialized setting is provided for students with intellectual challenges needing direct instruction, life skills experiences and support. There are currently 11 students participating in this instructional setting all requiring an alternate assessment.</li> <li>• A setting has been created for students with ASD. Students receive their core instruction within a self contained setting. Students may participate in Language! and/or core ELA determined by NECAP assessment scores. As appropriate with support, students participate in the general education setting.</li> <li>• A setting for students with behavioral health challenges has been established and is structured through a behavior intervention point system. Personnel for this program include a special educator, two assistant teachers, along with the support of two behavior technicians, a half time school psychologists/behavior coach and a social</li> </ul>			
--	---	--	--	--

		<p>worker who is available 2 ½ days per week. As students gain the appropriate level as determined by their earned points, participation in the general education setting increases. There are currently 14 students participating in this setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are approximately 18 students with IEPs in bilingual education. A general educator facilitates the core-curriculum in Spanish and a bilingual special education teacher provides support.</li> </ul> <p>There are approximately 766 students attending <b>Roger Williams Middle School</b>, with 181 students with IEPs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three classes for students with social emotional disabilities (Behavior Intervention Program) following a self-contained departmentalized class model are facilitated by a full-time behavior coach, physical therapist, social worker, classroom teacher assistant and a classroom behavior technician. Faculty and staff within this program are all certified in Crisis Prevention Intervention (CPI). The behavior management strategy offers students an opportunity to participate in the general education setting, inclusive and/or intervention classes based on a point system. Students play a major role in individualizing their program. Students receive departmentalized classes for tier III ELA and Math along with general education science and social studies. These classes are facilitated by three special educators with a total of 36 students.</li> <li>• A self-contained setting is provided for 13 bilingual students with IEPs facilitated by a long-term substitute teacher (who is not bilingual, but pursuing ESL certification) with the support of a bilingual teacher assistant. This class provides the core content and the intervention curriculum (TransMath, Language!, Science, Social Studies). There currently is no co-teaching within this model.</li> <li>• Seventeen students with IEPs participate in the bilingual resource model 2.5 days per week with as appropriate in-class and “pull-out” services and supports. Students receive Language! all day with one teacher, or resource support for no more than 2.5 days/week.</li> <li>• Some 8<sup>th</sup> graders tier III “inclusion and push-in” classes have IEP numbers that far exceed general education ( such as 17/24 in an 8<sup>th</sup> grade inclusion class, 13/15 in another and 12/22 in a third 8<sup>th</sup> grade push-in; 7<sup>th</sup> grade push-in 11/14; 181 IEPs; 24% total).</li> </ul> <p>There are approximately 515 students attending <b>Esek Hopkins Middle School</b>, with 92 students with IEPs.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A self-contained setting is provided for students with significant autism needing individualized direct instruction along with life skills experiences. The students receive all their instruction within the self-contained setting. There are currently nine students participating in this instructional model with all of the students requiring alternate assessment.</li> <li>• There are three ESL settings for eligible students with IEP's. One class is a self contained setting where students receive all of their instruction. Two additional settings are inclusive with pull out English.</li> </ul> <p>Following a middle school model <b>Gilbert Stuart Middle School</b> currently facilitates their educational program and instruction through two teams at each grade level (6<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup>). There are currently 750 students, attending the middle school, with 118 students with IEPs. 103 students participate in the inclusive program and 15 students are participating in the "push-in" program.</p> <p>a.) Throughout the middle level it was reported that communication regarding placement of students was limited prior to placement and/or follow up. Students have been placed from least restrictive to most restrictive settings, from program to program and from school to school without prior discussions and/or documentation. Behavior Intervention Plans along with IEP review recommendations reported to take 10 or more days with pushback from district administration. Students arrive with no notice or information. Additionally students with behavioral health challenges may move from school building to school building at middle level with limited communication and/or preparation for student's arrival. Concerns were expressed by teacher and administration for students who consistently have an increase of disciplinary issues as this movement takes place. ( JK 4, 10, 11) (RI Regulations 300.101 &amp; 300.114)</p> <p>b.) Policies and procedures for determining the need for bilingual special education, placements and movement along a continuum of services for ELLs with IEPs were not clear to teachers and staff at Roger Williams , Gilbert Stuart (JK 1, 3) and DelSesto (AW3) (RI Regulations 300.101 &amp; 300.114)</p> <p>c.) Special educators (new, returning to the field or special educators moving to other grades/school levels, i.e. elementary to middle etc.) have limited opportunity to gain systemic approaches to special education protocols, policies and related practices. With no common planning time and/or limited informal approaches to student planning, special educators are unclear as to the systemic approach to specific middle level special education practices (examples include requiring interpreters, evaluation/re-evaluation protocols, ESY determination, overall IEP writing and transition planning for eligible students) (see also Section II Evaluation/ IEP for additional information).</p>		<p>a.) Central office special education administration will review and refine protocols for student movement.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. Progress check: September 2012.</p> <p>b.) Central office special education administration will work with ELL administration to review and refine protocols and structure. Professional development will be provided to special educators</p>	<p>a) Issued resolved new special education director has issued a secondary placement procedure that is adhered to in the District. This has been reviewed with all administrators, guidance counselors, and teachers. Problem resolved see memo dated 1/15/2013\</p> <p>b) Issued resolved see memo dated</p>
--	---	--	---	--

				<p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. Progress check: December 2012</p> <p>c.) Professional development / technical assistance will be provided, regarding the special education policies, procedures and protocols.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. Progress check: December 2012.</p>	<p>4/24/13 explaining process from special education director &amp; ell director</p> <p>c) All special educators &amp; evaluation team members received professional development on special education procedural manual and all have access to a shared drive to access forms and procedures.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

Result/ Compliance	13	<p><b>Program Continuum High Level</b></p> <p><b>At Hope High School</b> there is approximately 1,300 students and 250 have IEPs. The program continuum is as follows:</p> <p>a.) Inclusion model- offered in Arts and Information Technology. Students are provided academic support from their inclusion teachers who collaborate with the classroom teacher. There are eight inclusion teachers. Approximately 35 students with IEPs participate in inclusive settings. Professional development opportunities in co-teaching was offered by the district, however, staff reported that the implementation of an inclusive model was inconsistent, ineffective and created more confusion. In addition, staff indicated the lack of common planning time and loss of early release days has an impact on co-teaching implementation. It is reported that the school will be returning to a block schedule for the 2012-2013 school year. Staff report that “friendly coverage” (45 minutes) can be requested if additional time is needed for case management, IEPs, etc. (RI Regulations 300.101 &amp; 300.114)</p> <p>-Departmental self-contained classes in information technology. This program is made up of a team of seven teachers with each special educator responsible for one core subject (English, math, social studies and science) of which they are highly qualified. Students may attend core subjects in general education determined by academic strength and outlined in the IEP. All students attend elective courses with the general population. Accommodations and modifications outlined in the students IEP are made with the elective courses. Student to teacher ratio is 12:1 with one teacher assistant.</p> <p>-Behavior Intervention Program (five self-contained classes) - Offered in the Arts Community Program is taught by five special educators with each educator responsible for teaching one content area. Teachers are responsible for following the general education curriculum and providing accommodations and modifications as needed. All students have written behavioral plans, utilize a behavioral point system and differentiated classroom structure to help students succeed socially, emotionally and academically.</p> <p>-Students with intellectual disabilities (self-contained class setting)- offered in Arts Community, described as a life skills class focused on functional academics, daily living skills, social skills, community and vocational skills. Taught by one special educator, several teaching assistants and childcare workers. Child care workers are certified teaching assistants/CNAs. The student ratio is not to exceed 12 students in the classroom.</p> <p>-Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) Program (2 classrooms, lower/high functioning) - each taught by a special educator, teacher assistants as well as support from the social worker and psychologist. Based in a self-contained, structured, organized environment utilizing the TEACCH model or Treatment and Education of Autistic and related Communication of Handicapped Children. Resources, supports and curricula are targeted for this particular</p>	Data Analysis Interviews Observation	<p>a.) Professional development will continue to be provided on inclusive practices.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. Progress check: September 2012.</p>	<p>For 2012-2013 school years, Hope High School returned to the block schedule. The block schedule gives teachers an opportunity for common planning time which is beneficial for teachers in the co-teaching setting. The 8<sup>th</sup> period block vs. the 6<sup>th</sup> period standard 54 minute classes open up two extra period which allows for additional student offerings as well as an opportunity for teachers to build in common planning time. Staff reported that “friendly coverage” 45 minutes can be requested in additional time is needed for case management, IEP’s and common planning time, etc.</p> <p>Hope High School no .longer has early release days for 2012-2013 school years. So</p>
-----------------------	----	---	--	--	---

	<p>population of students. Some students in the higher functioning classroom are involved in the general population for elective classes and core content classes when appropriate. Student ratio is not to exceed 12 students within a classroom.</p> <p><b>At Mount Pleasant High School</b> there is approximately 927 students and 176 have IEPs. The program continuum is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Autism classroom- some students receive instruction in the Autism classroom, departmentalized classroom, and/or in a regular education classroom depending on the decision of the IEP team.</li> <li>- Departmentalized self-contained classes- students have academic classes in small classrooms with a special educator and a teacher assistant. These students follow the same guaranteed, viable, aligned curriculum (to Common Core State standards) as the students without disabilities. Some students also receive academic instruction partly in a special education class setting and partly in a general education class. The decision is made by the IEP team</li> <li>-Inclusive classes- students receive instruction in all general education classes. The students are supported by a special educator for as many hours as deemed appropriate by the IEP team.</li> <li>-Weekly advisory- addressing academics, career counseling, and graduation requirements, choosing classes for next year, testing strategies, career interest inventories, job applications and interviews, goal setting, coping skills, bullying, dress code, community services and learning styles.</li> <li>-Credit recovery- one credit class will meet twice per week from 3:00 p.m. to 5:15 p.m. for 10 weeks (40 hours of contact time); half-credit classes will have 20 hours of contact time. Credit recovery provided by special education teachers as well.</li> <li>-Weekly tutoring- every subject, after school, 1 1/2 hours a day, available for all students.</li> <li>-Skill streaming- group counseling on social/emotional skills development. Students participate if this in an IEP goal or if names come up via target teams as someone needing support in this area. This is an evidenced-based program.</li> </ul> <p><b>At Central High School</b> there are approximately 1,200 students and 200 have IEPs. The program continuum is as follows:</p> <p>b.) Co-taught classes (9<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup>) - There are approximately 30 co-taught inclusive classes. Co-teachers (special and general educators) are not assigned to work together in various classes</p>			<p>this no longer has an impact on co-teaching implementation.</p> <p>b.) For the 2013-2013 school year each Special Educator/co-teaching staff were allowed to work with one content area teacher.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

b.) Special

	<p>exclusively for the quarter. Instead there may be a variety special educators assigned throughout the week to provide “inclusion” support in the “inclusion class” (special educators reported working with up to eight general education teachers in various inclusive settings per week). General education teachers reported that scheduling in this manner provided “help or visiting assistance” but not a co-teacher. General education teachers reported wanting a co-teaching model as opposed to a “help or visit assistance” model. Special educators expressed great frustration at the lack of continuity and thus, their ability to be a consistent co-teacher in the class. Plans are underway to resolve this issue for the 2012-2013 school year. (RI Regulations 300.101 &amp; 300.114)</p> <p>c.) Self-contained departmentalized classes for math, science, ELA. This also includes two bilingual self-contained classes (all subject areas). Students have one teacher for three subject areas and the other for the other three core content classes. Not all of the special educators who teach these self-contained settings are highly qualified for the core content subject areas that they are currently teaching (example: Geometry, Algebra I, Chemistry and Physics). RIDE Title IIa will review and address the highly qualified issue. In regard to the science labs, the teacher is not comfortable using the lab equipment so students do small labs in class but do not have the same or similar labs that students in the general education classes receive. (RI Regulations 300.101 &amp; 300.114)</p> <p>9<sup>th</sup> graders (with and without IEPs) who score at a certain level on an algorithm ELA in 8<sup>th</sup> grade and scored below grade level on assessments take Ramp Up Math (one block, two credits with one credit being for math class and one for elective) and Language (one block, 2 credits with one for the ELA credit and one for an elective) are in the intervention classes. Both students with and without IEPs may be in the “intervention” classes based on need. This is considered the student’s core ELA and math class. Although these classes are called intervention they are core content classes for math and ELA (foundations classes).</p> <p>Students reported working with the teacher during their lunch time or after school to get assistance on projects or papers.</p> <p>There are a variety of support service personnel at Central High school (psychologist, social worker, truancy social worker) who co-run groups (social skills, anger management, etc.) in addition to weekly advisory and credit recovery options</p>		<p>education administration in conjunction with school based administration will resolve this issue for the 2012-2013 school year.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. Progress check: September 2012.</p> <p>c.) Students in the self-contained setting for science class will have access to the same labs that are available to typical peers.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing. Progress check: September 2012.</p>	<p>Special Educators made their own schedules making sure that all their inclusion students were receiving appropriate special education supports per their IEP.</p> <p>All teachers are following the guaranteed and viable curriculum with their students. Working in one content area allows the special education teacher to expand their content knowledge in one area and to be able to modify and make appropriate accommodations for the students.</p> <p>c.) For 2012-2013 school year, all students with disabilities have access to the same science labs as general education students. (See attached Science Course of Study and Schedules).</p> <p>All teachers follow the same core curriculum/common core standards and utilize the same lab for field and</p>
--	--	--	---	--

					laboratory work.
Result	14	Providence has in place an array of alternative options for completing high school. In addition to its four comprehensive high schools, Providence offers vocational/career programs, several public alternative high schools and a Transition Academy. Students with disabilities are included in the vocational/career programs and all of the alternative programs. The alternatives reflect varied approaches to engage those students whose abilities, talents or needs require opportunities other than traditional school environments. Some schools and programs provide	Data Analysis Interviews Observation		



	<p>smaller supportive communities that include project based learning, community service and internships.</p> <p><b>Juanita Sanchez Education Complex (JSEC)</b>  <i>Program Description</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As part of RIDE's Progressive Support and Intervention process, the JSEC was created as an Innovation and Transformation School. The Sanchez complex was created by combining two previously existing small high schools: the Providence Academy of International Studies (PAIS) and the William B. Cooley Health Science Technology High School. This year the Sanchez Complex is considered one high school with a unified administration and faculty.</li> </ul> <p><i>Enrollment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maximum – 800 students</li> <li>- Current – 666 students of which 96 are students with IEPs.</li> </ul> <p><i>Special Education Services</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The school has five special educators who co-teach in 28 general education math, science and English classes. There are also 4 teacher assistants who provide support to students in general education classes which are not co-taught.</li> <li>- There is one self-contained class setting with a teacher and teacher assistant. Some students leave the class to receive instruction in co-taught general education classes as part of the new “push in” model. All students receive their elective classes, physical education and advisory in general education settings.</li> <li>- Related service staff includes a part time social worker, psychologist, speech/language and vision teachers.</li> </ul> <p><i>Strengths</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Co teachers collaborate on planning, instruction, assessment and grading.</li> <li>- Teachers have common planning time for grade level and subject area planning.</li> <li>- Block scheduling, extended days (1 hour extra 3 days per week) and extended year of 3 additional days provide increased instructional time.</li> <li>- Double blocks of math and English allow access to the general curriculum and specific instruction to address specific skill deficits.</li> <li>- PBGR and academic support programs: Ramp Up to Algebra, senior presentation class, after school tutoring, and credit recovery.</li> </ul> <p><i>Challenges.</i>  Lack of school wide social/emotional positive behavior supports contributes to high detention and suspension rates (no Rtl team has been established). See Response to Intervention (Rtl) at the High School Level (item #8 in this section) for support plan.</p> <p><b>Providence Academy of International Studies (PAIS)</b>  <i>Program Description</i>  The program is designed to provide an internationally focused college bound</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>curriculum through the study of global relations, political sciences, language arts, international business and cultural studies.</p> <p><b>Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The program provides unique opportunities for students to pursue international courses and tracks.</li> <li>- Community relationships with 6+ organizations; e.g. International Institute, Bryant College School of International Business, the University of Rhode Island, Providence College and Johnson &amp; Wales enhance the program.</li> </ul> <p><b>Health/Science/Technology</b></p> <p><i>Program Descriptions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The program is designed in collaboration with the HELP Coalition to provide students with a core high school curriculum as well as curricular opportunities in the health, science and technology field. In addition, students are provided experiential opportunities in their field of choice.</li> </ul> <p><i>Strengths</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The majority of students with IEPs are fully integrated in the general education curriculum supported by special education co-teachers.</li> <li>- Community relationships with the health/education/leadership committee, RIDE, Amgen, Community College of Rhode Island, Lifespan, CVS and the RI Blood Center enhance the program and provide internships for students.</li> </ul> <p><b>E-Cubed Academy</b></p> <p><i>Program Description</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Academy is a small, student centered, teaching community which provides students with a core high school curriculum. The Academy's organization and infrastructure are based on all the principles of best practice: small learning communities of students who attend advisories, experience personalized, engaged teaching and project based instruction.</li> </ul> <p><i>Application Process</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Students apply and are selected by lottery. Students who have siblings attending the Academy or who live in the neighborhood are given priority.</li> </ul> <p><i>Enrollment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maximum – 400 total with 80 students with IEPs.</li> <li>- Current – 393 total with 70 students with IEPs and 25 ELL students.</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p><i>Special Education Services</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Special education students are fully included in general education classes which are co-taught by a highly qualified content area teacher and special educator. There are 4 special education inclusion teachers who co-teach in 18 general education classes.</li> <li>- The Academy also has a part time school social worker, school psychologist and student assistance counselor.</li> </ul> <p><i>Strengths</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Special education students are fully integrated in the general education curriculum supported by special education co-teachers.</li> <li>- PBGR and academic support programs: Ramp Up to Algebra, Saturday School, NECAP Boot Camp, daily after school tutoring, credit recovery and Summer Targeted Instruction for Math.</li> <li>- Community relationships with several institutes of higher education and community mental health centers enhance the program.</li> </ul> <p><i>Challenges</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of common planning time.</li> <li>-Although some new computers were purchased this past summer, there is still a need to replace old technology to allow students to access Diploma Plus and the internet.</li> </ul> <p><b>Providence Career and Technical Academy (PCTA)</b></p> <p><i>Program Description</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PCTA is a technical high school which provides students with a core high school curriculum and technical training in nine different career fields. Students graduating from PCTA receive both a diploma and industry recognized certification in their chosen career field.</li> </ul> <p><i>Application Process</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Students apply and are selected by a lottery system. If only the maximum number of students apply for a particular technical area, the lottery system is not used and all are accepted.</li> </ul> <p><i>Enrollment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maximum – 800 students</li> <li>- Current – 500 with 129 students with IEPs</li> </ul> <p><i>Special Education Services</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are 4.5 special education inclusion teachers who co-teach in 22 general education classes.</li> <li>- There are 4 teacher assistants, 2 of which provide support in technical and core content classes.</li> <li>- The school has two self-contained settings with a teacher and teacher assistant.</li> <li>- Related service staff includes a social worker and a school psychologist.</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p><b>Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- State of the art facilities.</li> <li>- Industry experienced technical staff.</li> <li>- PBGR and academic support programs: Ramp Up to Algebra, NECAP Prep Workshops, resume writing seminars, after school tutoring and Saturday tutoring</li> <li>- Extended days – 8 hours per day.</li> </ul> <p><b>Challenges.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of common planning time.</li> <li>- Lack of school wide social/emotional positive behavior supports contributes to high detention and suspension rates. No Rtl team has been established. See Response to Intervention (Rtl) at the High School Level (item #8 in this section) for support plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Transition Academy at Johnson &amp; Wales</b></p> <p><i>Program Description</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Providence Transition Academy is designed for students ages 18 to 21 who have met all the PBGR requirements for graduation but still have unmet transition goals. The Academy provides students with a curriculum based vocational and career exploration program that extends time for students to meet their transition goals.</li> </ul> <p><i>Application Process</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Students are referred to the program through their IEP teams which Academy staff attends. Students must be ORS eligible and have a completed vocational assessment. Students are then interviewed to determine their suitability for the program.</li> </ul> <p><i>Enrollment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Academy's current enrollment is 15 with a maximum enrollment of 16.</li> </ul> <p><i>Special Education Services</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Academy staff consists of a director, special education teacher, teacher assistant and social worker.</li> </ul> <p><b>Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strong vocational and career curriculum which addresses student interests, functional computer, daily living and personal/social skills, and self advocacy skills.</li> <li>- Students experience 2 to 3 on the job experiences based on their interests and vocational assessment.</li> <li>- Small group atmosphere in a college environment.</li> <li>- Community partnerships with Education in Action, RI Department of Health, RI Food Bank, Cox Communications, Federal Hill House, Children's Friends and Families, Cherry Hill/Berkshire Nursing Home and Sedexo Food Services all contribute to providing multiple community opportunities for students.</li> </ul> <p><b>Challenges</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of access to technology.</li> <li>- Need for more student mentors.</li> </ul>			
--	---	--	--	--

		<p><b>Birch Vocational Program</b></p> <p><i>Program Description</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Birch Vocational Program is a school within a school at the Mount Pleasant High School complex. The program is designed to serve students with moderate to severe intellectual disabilities. The program provides students with an individualized education program aligned with the RI GSEs and AAGSEs. The program also provides students with functional vocational and career related skills.</li> </ul> <p><i>Application Process</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Students are referred to the program through their IEP teams.</li> </ul> <p><i>Enrollment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Current enrollment is 78 students.</li> </ul> <p><i>Special Education Services</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The program staff consists of 8 special education teachers, a community transitional liaison, an art teacher and full time nurse. The staff also has eighteen teacher assistants and seven child care workers. Related service staff include a full time speech language therapist, 4/5 OT, 3/5 PT, and 1/5 social worker and school psychologist.</li> </ul> <p><i>Strengths</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Individualized curriculum based on GSEs and AAGSEs.</li> <li>- Collaborative and supportive staff in a small community like environment.</li> <li>- Backpack and gardening programs designed to provide functional vocation related skills and community experiences.</li> <li>- Community based vocational experiences.</li> <li>- Active parent involvement and outreach program.</li> <li>- Community partnerships include Walmart, Forte Jewelers, Training to Placement, Temple Beth Israel Social Action Committee and the Fogarty School Silver Springs Annex provide students with multiple community and vocational related experiences.</li> </ul> <p><i>Challenges</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of opportunities for students to access typical peers.</li> <li>- Limited vocational workshop and community based sites.</li> <li>- While there currently are no regulatory related problems concerning space for the program, increased enrollment has made space a premium and will need to be considered prior to expanding the program beyond its' current enrollment.</li> </ul>			
Compliance	15	<p><b>Adaptive Physical Education (APE)</b></p> <p>Adaptive Physical Education is provided as appropriate per the IEP. However, at DelSesto Middle School APE educators are not invited to their specific students IEP's. (RI Regulations 300.108)</p>	Data Analysis Interviews Observation	Central office special education administrators will address and resolve.	Issued resolved see memo dated 4/22/13

				Timeline: Immediately and ongoing Progress check : December 2012	
Result	16	<b>Extended School Year (ESY)</b>  Each March, the special education central office forwards information packets to special educators for ESY determination. Teachers apply ESY criteria, collect data over vacation to determine/document regression, and forward their ESY recommendations to the special education office. Special educator perception is that ESY decisions are not made through the IEP process by the IEP team but through the central office administrators who review the staff recommendations and inform the special educators of the final decisions regarding who will receive ESY. Special educators then follow-up with letters home to parents regarding the summer program. For students with more significant needs, ESY is an established process. For students' with IEPs with less significant disabilities special educators could discuss the procedure, although the general perception is that it is not provided for those students as they would not be eligible. (RI Regulations 300.106)	Data Analysis Interviews Observation	ESY protocols have been reviewed and refined. Professional development will be provided to all special educators regarding ESY for the upcoming school year.  Timeline: Immediately and ongoing Progress check: December 2012	Issued Resolved see attached ESY guidance document and ESY decision making
Result	17	<b>Local Special Education Advisory Committee (LAC)</b>  A local advisory committee with membership, operation, and scheduled meetings, consistent with Regents' requirements is in place and is supported by the district.  The Providence School District maintains an active Local Special Education Advisory Committee (LAC). All special education administrators (directors and supervisors) attend all meetings. The LAC has active members and an identified leadership team that represents the diversity of the district.  Accomplishments to date include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership team identified.</li> <li>• LAC brochures and notices distributed in English and Spanish including a schedule of meetings and topics.</li> <li>• Three meetings held thus far had promising attendance levels.</li> <li>• Leadership team planning meetings with district leadership.</li> </ul>	Document Review Interviews		

		<p>Goals for the LAC include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation in the Special Education Advisory Network Dinner and upcoming training in March.</li> <li>• Leadership team participation in school based parent zones, PTOs, and the Parent Advisory Council (PAC).</li> <li>• Six meetings for the 2011-2012 school year</li> </ul>			
Result	18	<p><b>School Efforts to Partner with Parents (State Performance Plan Indicator #8)</b></p> <p>The district's rate of parent participation in the annual Special Education Statewide Parent Survey (2010-2011) is 9% of parents whose children have IEPs.</p> <p>Of parents with a child receiving special education services who participated in the last survey, the percent that reported that their school's efforts to involve parents, as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, are at or above the state standard is 31%.</p> <p>Negative staff/student interactions were observed in some isolated instances and some schools have established strong, student-centered, positive cultures that proactively support belonging and social-emotional development of all school members.</p>	Data Analysis State Performance Plan		
Result	19	<p><b>Drop Out /Graduation Rate (State Performance Plan Indicators #1 and #2)</b></p> <p>The Providence Public Schools graduation rate is 68% for all students and 52.80% for students with disabilities. These rates are notably lower than the state average rates of 75.80% for all students and 57.20% for students with disabilities.</p> <p>The Providence Public Schools dropout rate is 23.4% for all students and 34.7% for students with disabilities. These rates are notably higher than the state average rates of 14.10% for all students and 23.60% for students with disabilities.</p>	Data Analysis State Performance Plan		

<b>2. EVALUATION/ INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM (IEP)</b>					
Indicator		Findings	Documentation	Support Plan	Follow-up

					Findings
Result/ Compliance	1	<p>Records of approximately 67 students were reviewed prior to the on-site review by the team leaders. Students' records were very accessible. An additional 29 records were reviewed during the on-site process (96 total). The overall record review process identified the following for both the elementary level and secondary level (middle and high school):</p> <p>(elementary and secondary level)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Parent consent and subsequent evaluation outside of regulatory timeframe.</li> <li>- IEP invitation/notice does not state that the purpose of the IEP meeting includes consideration of post-secondary goals and transition services.</li> <li>- Written prior notice of IEP meeting not in central file and goes beyond requirements by asking for parent signature.</li> <li>- Required participants not present at IEP meetings (general educator, special educator, ESL/bilingual specialist, parent/student).</li> <li>-Meeting notice did not indicate who will be in attendance and not attached.</li> <li>- Written notice &amp; written communications to parent in native language are not evidenced.</li> <li>- Functional present levels of performance does not include specific baseline measure for those areas developed into an annual goal</li> <li>-Baseline statements, measurable annual goals and short-term objectives not quantifiable or measurable.</li> <li>- Explanation of Nonparticipation in Regular Class, Extracurricular and Nonacademic Areas missing</li> <li>- There is no evidence of ESY criteria used as a basis for determination of ESY eligibility for all students.</li> <li>- Evidence is incomplete on how student's progress will be measured <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a.) The type of data is documented</li> <li>b.) How often is the data collected</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>(Secondary level)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Program of study section incomplete or completed incorrectly.</li> <li>- Transition services are not listed as a coordinated set of activities</li> <li>-Students in the high school "behavior" programs were "exempt" from the foreign language requirements (see also student specific compliance issues)</li> </ul> <p>Also of note for all records:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Frequency for special education and related services does not follow the required RIDE format for reporting hours per day, days per week, and weeks per month.</li> </ul> <p>(RI Regulations Subpart D Evaluations, Eligibility Determinations, Individualized Education Programs and Educational Placements)</p>	Data Analysis Interviews Observation	<p>Assurances will be provided to the Rhode Island Department of Education, Office of Student, Community and Academic Supports, that compliance issues are addressed and rectified. This Support Plan is applicable for all compliance findings in this section.</p> <p>Timeline: April 2013</p>	



Result	2	<p>A group of eight individuals comprise the child outreach team and are available to screen three-five year old children throughout the school year with all five year olds screened at the beginning of their kindergarten year. All parents complete a home language screening to identify their primary language. If it is identified to be a language other than English, the child will be screened by a bilingual screener or with the assistance of an interpreter if it is a language other than Spanish. Child outreach screenings are available in a range of community-based early childhood programs and by appointment September through June. The preschool coordinator collaborates with a variety of community partners and creates innovative procedures to reach as many preschoolers as possible. The screeners attend the state supported trainings and the intervention specialist for the teams attends the child outreach network meetings.</p> <p>All screening instruments are reliable, valid measures as delineated in "Best Practice Guidelines for Child Outreach Screening Programs in Rhode Island".</p> <p>The state target for screening is 80% of children ages 3, 4, and 5. In Providence's most recent Consolidated Resource Plan, the district reports the following screening percentages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 year olds: 30%</li> <li>• 4 year olds: 36%</li> <li>• 5 year olds: 76%</li> </ul> <p>Compared to last year's results, these percentages reflect an increase of 3 and 4 year olds that received child outreach screenings.</p>	State Performance Plan data Interviews		
Result/ Compliance	3	<p><b>Child Find (State Performance Plan Indicator #11)</b></p> <p>Providence Public Schools for the 2010-2011 year was at 96.68 % compliance for meeting evaluation timelines for initial referrals. As of 12/23/11 Providence Public Schools was thus far at 90% compliance for meeting evaluation timelines for initial referrals for the 2011-2012 school year.</p> <p>When a re-evaluation approaches or an individual teacher or parent feels that a student's placement warrants reconsideration, the district does not generally consider this via the IEP process. Staff request that the evaluation team (still referred to in some schools as the "MDT") add the student to one of the team's upcoming weekly agendas. When the student is being discussed, the parent is invited to the meeting (but not issued written notice of an IEP meeting). Sometimes the parent does not attend this discussion. Providence does have procedures for IEP reviews but the perception and process is that the MDT is utilized instead of an IEP review. RI Regulations 300.322(1)</p> <p>The special education supervisor and/or assistant supervisor leads the team discussion of the</p>	State Performance Plan data	<p>Professional development / technical assistance will be provided to special educators on the roles and responsibilities regarding evaluation teams versus IEP teams.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing Progress check : March 2013</p>	<p>Issued resolved all special education teachers received professional development – on special education procedure, IEP decision making</p>

		re-evaluation and/or placement review and/or re-determination of eligibility with other evaluation team members as well as the special and general educator, and parent, if attending. The evaluation team members as well as IEP team members determine re-evaluations to be conducted. Regarding placement reviews, if the team (typically including the supervisor) agrees with the change of placement, the change is determined, and an IEP team meeting is convened to revise the IEP. (RI Regulations 300.321)			and making data based decisions.
Result/ Compliance	4	<b>Accommodations</b>  The degree to which general education teachers including itinerant are informed about their students' accommodations, needs, goals and objectives was inconsistent among schools and classes. Some general educators prompt their special education colleagues at the start of the year, review IEPs and sometimes obtain copies of accommodation pages or IEPs; others become informed by their co-teacher over time; some report they've never seen the IEP or accommodations page and would like to have access but have not inquired about the process. (RI Regulations 300.320(6)(i))	Data Analysis Interviews Observation	The district will ensure that general education staff have consistent access to the web based IEP/IEP at a Glance.  Timeline: Immediately and ongoing Progress check : December 2012	Issued resolved see memo dated 11/1/2013 – this was also reviewed with teacher leaders.
Result/ Compliance	5	<b>IEP/Evaluation Issues</b>  Required members are generally present at IEP meetings. On team meeting days, a substitute teacher is available to cover classes for general education teacher participation. Interpreters are consistently made available at meetings as requested. Bilingual staff also converse with parents as needed without interpreters always being necessary.  At Central High School many staff reported that general educators sign the IEP but typically do not participate in the IEP meeting due to coverage issues. Staff was unclear with regard to the excusal process. (RI Regulations 300.321(2))		Special education administration will address and resolve.  Timeline: Immediately and ongoing Progress check : December 2012	For 2012-2013 school year, an additional substitute was added to provide coverage for IEP/evaluative team meetings. Central High School has a sub to provide coverage to enable general education teachers to

					<p>attend meetings.</p> <p>All staff have received copies of the updated Procedural Manual for special education containing all procedures related to IEP meetings. A memo was sent to all special educators in December 2012.</p>
Compliance	6	<p><b>Specific Student Compliance Issues</b></p> <p><b>Elementary Level</b></p> <p>The current placement of two students with IEPs in bilingual programming is questionable. For example, some English/Spanish bilingual co-taught classes include the two students whose primary language is neither language, with students who are Native American language speakers (Q'eché) placed in an English/Spanish bilingual class (SA5, 8). The lack of progress of these students over time relative to standards and relative to the peers in their intervention groups evidences a continuously widening achievement gap at the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades, respectively. Currently, IEP reviews are occurring for these students to determine student need and progress (SA5, 8). (RI Regulations 300.101 &amp; 300.114)</p> <p>Delivery of reading interventions/specialized instruction is not provided in accordance with the IEP for some students at Spaziano. Their small group reading intervention serves as their specialized instruction in reading and this was assigned by the principal and assistant principal to the general educator or someone other than the designated bilingual special educator. Although the district supervisor instructed staff to review affected students to determine progress and consider whether IEP amendments were warranted, such review and applicable</p>	Interviews Observation Record Review	<p>Special education administration will review and ensure that all student specific compliance issues have been resolved.</p> <p>. Timeline: Immediately and ongoing Progress check : December 2012</p>	<p>Issued resolved: IEP reviews were conducted for all students in question to determine if services provided were meeting student learning and ELL needs</p>

		<p>amendments did not occur (SA10, 11, 12, 13). (RI Regulations 300.17(d))</p> <p><b>High School Level</b></p> <p>The student’s accommodation sheet provided to general education teachers did not have all of her program modifications/supports listed on her IEP (SW1) (“....student will be provided with de-escalation strategies”). Her general education teachers were unaware of this specific support per her IEP. (RI Regulations 320.6)(1))</p> <p>Staff repeatedly reported the perception that administration told them that all students in self-contained classes and “behavior” programs were “exempt” from the foreign language requirements. This is then put into their IEP (SW5, SW3). As noted on the Providence record review summary it is unclear why this is done as this does not allow the same equity of access to the full array of the education curriculum. Administration is working to remedy this issue. (RI Regulations 300.101 &amp; 300.114)</p> <p>Social studies and ELA teachers (SW3) did not modify any school work (per IEP) for the student. (RI Regulations 320.6)(1))</p>			<p>SA5: 10/25/12 SA8: 5/30/12 IEP reviews held for all students to ensure IEP service hours were in compliance Compensatory services offered to students whose IEPs did not match service hours. SA 10: 4/5/12 SA11: 4/5/12 SA12:4/3/12 SA13:4/4/12</p>									
Result/ Compliance	7	<p><b>Due Process Information (State Performance Plan Indicators #16, #17,#18 &amp; #19)</b></p> <p><b><u>COMPLAINTS</u></b> <b><u>2009</u></b> <b><u># of Complaints:</u></b></p> <table> <tr> <td></td> <td><i>ISSUE(S)</i></td> <td><i>RESULT</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Complaint #1</i></td> <td>IEP</td> <td>Finding of Non-Compliance</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Complaint #2</i></td> <td>IEP</td> <td>Finding of Non-Compliance</td> </tr> </table>		<i>ISSUE(S)</i>	<i>RESULT</i>	<i>Complaint #1</i>	IEP	Finding of Non-Compliance	<i>Complaint #2</i>	IEP	Finding of Non-Compliance	Data Analysis	All findings of noncompliance have been addressed and resolved as verified by the RIDE.	
	<i>ISSUE(S)</i>	<i>RESULT</i>												
<i>Complaint #1</i>	IEP	Finding of Non-Compliance												
<i>Complaint #2</i>	IEP	Finding of Non-Compliance												

Complaint #3	Other	Finding of Compliance
Complaint #4	Placement	Finding of Compliance
Complaint #5	Other/FAPE	Part Compliant & Non-Compliant
Complaint #6	Other	Finding of Non-Compliance
Complaint #7	Other/FAPE	Part Compliant & Non-Compliant
Complaint #8	Discipline/FAPE	Finding of Non-Compliance
Complaint #9	IEP	Finding of Non-Compliance
Complaint #10	Other	Finding of Non-Compliance
Complaint #11	Placement	Finding of Non-Compliance
Complaint #12	IEP	Finding of Non-Compliance
Complaint #13	Other/Transportation	Finding of Non-Compliance

### **2010**

#### **# of Complaints:**

	ISSUE(S)	RESULT
Complaint #1	IEP	Finding of Compliance
Complaint #2	Placement	Finding of Compliance
Complaint #3	Other/FAPE	Finding of Non-Compliance
Complaint #4	Other/FAPE	Hearing Requested
Complaint #5	IEP	Finding of Non-Compliance
Complaint #6	IEP	Finding of Non-Compliance
Complaint #7	IEP	Finding of Non-Compliance
Complaint #8	IEP	Finding of Non-Compliance
Complaint #9	IEP	Finding of Non-Compliance
Complaint #10	IEP	Finding of Non-Compliance
Complaint #11	IEP	Finding of Non-Compliance

### **2011**

#### **# of Complaints:** No complaints thus far for this period

### **MEDIATIONS**

### **2009**

#### **# of Mediations:**

	ISSUE(S)	RESULT
Mediation #1	Placement	Agreement Reached
Mediation #2	Other/Appropriate Services	Agreement Reached
Mediation #3	Other/1:1	No Agreement Reached

Mediation #4	Placement	Withdrawn
Mediation #5	Placement	Agreement Reached
Mediation #6	IEP	Agreement Reached
Mediation #7	Placement	Agreement Reached
Mediation #8	Other/Transportation	Agreement Reached

## **2010**

### **# of Mediations:**

	ISSUE(S)	RESULT
Mediation #1	Placement	No Agreement Reached
Mediation #2	IEP/Timelines	Agreement Reached
Mediation #3	Placement	Agreement Reached
Mediation #4	Other/Services	Agreement Reached

## **2011**

### **# of Mediations:**

	ISSUE(S)	RESULT
Mediation #1	Placement	No Agreement Reached
Mediation #2	Placement	Agreement Reached
Mediation #3	Other/Program	Agreement Reached
Mediation #4	Placement	Agreement Reached
Mediation #5	Placement	No Agreement Reached
Mediation #6	Placement	Withdrawn
Mediation #7	Placement	Agreement Reached
Mediation #8	Other/Services	Agreement Reached

## **HEARINGS**

### **2009**

#### **# of Hearings:**

	ISSUE(S)	FINDING(S)
Hearing #1	Other/1:1	Dismissed

### **2010**

#### **# of Hearings:**

	ISSUE(S)	FINDING(S)
--	----------	------------

		<table><tr><td>Hearing #1</td><td>Other/FAPE</td><td>Withdrawn/Settlement Agreement</td></tr></table>	Hearing #1	Other/FAPE	Withdrawn/Settlement Agreement						
Hearing #1	Other/FAPE	Withdrawn/Settlement Agreement									
		<p><b><u>2011</u></b> <b><u># of Hearings:</u></b></p> <table><tr><td></td><td>ISSUE(S)</td><td>FINDING(S)</td></tr><tr><td>Hearing #1</td><td>Placement</td><td>Resolution Session Agreement</td></tr></table>		ISSUE(S)	FINDING(S)	Hearing #1	Placement	Resolution Session Agreement			
	ISSUE(S)	FINDING(S)									
Hearing #1	Placement	Resolution Session Agreement									

<b>3. IDEA TRANSITION</b>					
Indicator		Findings	Documentation	Support Plan	Follow-up Findings
Compliance	1	<p><b>Part C to Part B Transition (Indicator #12)</b></p> <p>The preschool Director/Child Outreach Coordinator manages the transition of children from Part C Early Intervention (EI) to preschool special education and makes every attempt to have students in service upon their 3<sup>rd</sup> birthday. A database of all EI referrals is maintained and upcoming birthdates are monitored to ensure that meetings are scheduled in a timely manner. Last year's consolidated resource plan (CRP) indicated that the district achieved 94% compliance and that 188 children referred from Early Intervention and found eligible from preschool special education had IEPs developed and implemented by their 3<sup>rd</sup> birthday. Barriers to 100% compliance include later referrals from EI and parental cancellations. (RI Regulations 300.124(a))</p>	Data Analysis Interviews State Performance Plan	<p>The action plan submitted by the district to address early intervention transition will be adhered to in order to achieve 100%.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing Progress check : December 2012</p>	Issued resolved see memo dated 4/22/13 from Mindy Mertz
Result/ Compliance	2	<p><b>IDEA Transition Planning at the Middle Level</b></p> <p>At the middle level students who are 14 years of age with IEPs may or may not engage in an interest inventory and/or vocational assessment to inform their IEPs. Some special educators noted the use of WayToGoRI, the TPI, Learn More Indiana, Career Clickers and the Personal Economics Career Interest Inventory as vocational assessments for students. After completion of assessments they are placed in the "blue transition folder" to be viewed by the high school faculty for planning. However, results of transition assessments are not being utilized in the development of transition post-secondary goals. A comprehensive systemic approach to transition planning for eligible students with disabilities has not been established, however as noted, efforts are emerging (JK3, 4, 7, 8, 9). (RI Regulations 300.43)</p>	Data Analysis Interviews Observation	The district's new "Transition Framework" is in the internal approval process. This will be the district's systemic overview of potential assessment opportunities as well as provide clarity on roles and responsibilities.	Issued resolved see below response : At the middle school level, an 8 <sup>th</sup> grade

				<p>Professional development will be provided on the transition framework to both special educators and parents.</p> <p>Timeline: Immediately and ongoing Progress check : December 2012</p>	<p>transition elective will also provided in the 2014-2015 school year</p>
Result/ Compliance	3	<p><b>IDEA Transition Planning at the High School Level</b></p> <p>At the high school level it became apparent that vocational assessments are being facilitated but are not infused or not used to drive any part of the IEP (see also high school records reviewed/findings for further information).</p> <p>All high schools have representatives to the Transition Advisory Committee (TAC). These individuals disseminate transitional information, assist with transition related career exploration, and professional development opportunities.</p> <p>Hope, Mount Pleasant, Providence Career and Technical Academy, E-Cubed Academy and Juanita Sanchez Academy have a "Transition" class that utilizes a comprehensive transition curriculum. The class is designed for 1<sup>st</sup> year 11<sup>th</sup> graders and 2<sup>nd</sup> year 12<sup>th</sup> graders (1 year transition credit). Plans are underway to offer the same class at Central High School for the 2012-2013 school year. (RI Regulations 300.43)</p>	<p>Data Analysis Interviews Observation</p>	<p>The district's new "Transition Framework" is in the internal approval process. This will be the district's systemic overview of potential assessment opportunities as well as provide clarity on roles and responsibilities. Professional development will be provided on the transition framework to both special educators and parents. Timeline: Immediately and ongoing Progress check : December 2012</p>	<p>Issued resolved all secondary special education teachers received professional development on implementing the information from transition assessment in the IEP. Further a new elective will be instituted for a full year called the transition elective for</p>



					<p>11<sup>th</sup> graders to provide students with needed access to implement transition services.</p> <p>Professional development and training was also provided for teacher leaders on the use of transition assessment in the IEP so that they can provide further training and development in this area. Special education department worked with technology to ensure all transition assessment were placed on</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					every special educators computer for easy access.
Result	4	Project Work is the point for the Office of Rehabilitation Services (ORS) referrals throughout the district. Case managers are the point for Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD) referrals.	Interviews Document Review		
Result	5	Summary of Performance (SOP) is facilitated by the case manager as appropriate.	Interviews Document Review		
Result	6	Youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, and transition services. The Providence Public Schools are 98.43% compliant with the requirement. ( <b>State Performance Plan Indicator #13</b> )	Interviews Document Review		
Result	7	66.20 % of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and who have been employed, enrolled in postsecondary school, or both within 1 year of leaving high school. The State average was 78%. ( <b>State Performance Plan Indicator #14</b> )	Interviews Document Review		